DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 186 710 CE 025 298

AUTHOR	Apker, Wesley
TITLE	Policy Issues in Interrelating Vocational Education and CETA. Occasional Paper No. 56.
INSTITUTION	Ohio State Univ., Columbus. National Center for Research in Vocational Education.
PUB DATE	Dec 79
NOTE	20p.; Paper presented at the National Center for Research in Vocational Education.
AVAILABLE FROM	National Center Publications, The National Center for Research in Vocational Education, The Ohio State University, 1960 Kenny Rd., Columbus, OH 43210 ($1.90)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Agency Cooperation; Cooperative Programs; *Coordination; Federal Programs; Labor Force Development; *Policy; Political Issues; Program Improvement; Program Validation; *Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS	*Comprehensive Employment and Training Act

ABSTRACT

Vocational education programs cannot and should not serve all the population groups targeted by the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA). Rather, they should and must collaborate and cooperate with the manpower community. In order to do that five major policy issues need to be dealt with: getting agreements to collaborate, prime sponsor and local education agency linkages, vocational education delivery system, education credit, and extended school days, facilities, and teachers. Although there is a basis for collaboration, there must be someone to play the role of facilitator/catalyst. In the absence of preexisting trust between CETA and vocational education, the development of a sense of shared interdependence is needed. Toward these ends, vocational education must examine the redefine the scope of responsibilities of the discipline, documenting the effectiveness and costs of current programs while discarding those which are no longer useful. It also must gear itself to serve the needs of a rapidly aging population. Each student should have his or her own IEP (individal employment program) developed, with the granting of academic credit for work experience as appropriate. The traditional school day must be extended, as must the settings in which vocational education can be offered. Inservice education for school personnel also is essential. Vocational education must respond to the demographic time bomb set to go off in 1995 by instituting systematic changes capable of accomodating these population shifts. Time is running out for the vocational education and manpower communities to work together voluntarily. (Answers to nine questions from the audience of educational research and development personnel are appended.) (MEK)

ED186710

Occasional Paper No. 56

POLICY ISSUES IN INTERRELATING VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AND CETA

by

Wesley Apker
Executive Director
National Association of State Boards of Education

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Joel Magisos

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

The National Center for Research in Vocational Education
The Ohio State University
1960 Kenny Road
Columbus, Ohio 43210

December 1979

CE 025 278

THE NATIONAL CENTER MISSION STATEMENT

The National Center for Research in Vocational Education's mission is to increase the ability of diverse agencies, institutions, and organizations to solve educational problems relating to individual career planning, preparation, and progression. The National Center fulfills its mission by:

- Generating knowledge through research
- Developing educational programs and products
- Evaluating individual program needs and outcomes
- Installing educational programs and products
- Operating information systems and services
- Conducting leadership development and training programs

PREFACE

We are indebted to Dr. Wesley Apker, executive director of the National Association of State Boards of Education, for sharing with us his views on policy issues with respect to CETA and vocational education.

Dr. Apker's speech, entitled "Policy Issues in Interrelating Vocational Education and CETA," was timely and thought-provoking. It raised many interesting questions, particularly in the area of future directions in vocational education and training. In his remarks, Dr. Apker pointed out that vocational education leaders are faced with enormous challenges for the future. The makeup of the population of the country will shift from a younger to a significantly older population. Minority groups will demand an equal share in job opportunities, and the economy will continue to require more complex and sophisticated training for jobs which do not as yet exist. If vocational educators hope to make a meaningful impact on training for the rapid changes we will see in the coming decades, they must be prepared to think in new and creative ways and be willing to try new and different approaches to the problems these changes will inevitably bring.

Dr. Apker received his doctorate in education from the University of Washington. He holds a master's degree in education from Washington State University and two bachelor's degrees, in education and English, from Pacific Lutheran University. He has been a teacher, counselor, and administrator and has served as consultant and administrative assistant to the Superintendent of Public Instruction in the state of Washington. Dr. Apker has been executive director of the National Association of State Boards of Education since 1974. He is widely published and is the recipient of numerous awards for distinguished service in the field of education.

The National Center for Research in Vocational Education and The Ohio State University are pleased to share with you Dr. Apker's presentation, "Policy Issues in Interrelating Vocational Education and CETA."

Robert E. Taylor
Executive Director
The National Center for Research
in Vocational Education

POLICY ISSUES IN INTERRELATING VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AND CETA

Why did Congress choose CETA rather than vocational education as the vehicle to provide education and entry level job training to the poor and the unemployed? While it is true that the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1961 and its many subsequent amendments provided an easy foundation upon which to build, it can also be argued that the Vocational Education Act could have just as easily served as the foundation. That the Vocational Education Act wasn't used attests either to a congressional belief that vocational education had not been responsive enough, or that the target audience to be served could not be best served by existing education-oriented as opposed to skill-training-oriented vocational education programs. Whatever the reasons, Congress did enact new youth initiatives and it has committed substantial federal dollars utilizing CETA as the vehicle. Congress has mandated that the schools must receive a not insignificant portion of these funds. Most recently it has mandated that some of the funds be used to encourage cooperation and collaboration between the education and manpower communities.

How willing, how committed, and how prepared are the general education and vocational education communities to serve the client population targeted by CETA, and how willing are we to make program adjustments to accommodate the learning and training needs of this population? It is always dangerous to generalize, but it is my perception that educators on the firing line are not "wildly enthusiastic" about serving the total target population. (But then, I'm not certain, based upon the early statistics, that the manpower community is any more enthusiastic about serving dropouts.) Neither am I certain how eager the education community is to make program adjustments to accommodate both the requirements of the law and the learning and training needs of the targeted populations. Finally, since vocational education has rarely demonstrated through goals and objectives that it sees skill training as a major part of its service delivery responsibility, major adjustments, new thinking, and retraining will be needed if vocational education decides to meet the skill training needs of the target population.

Before proceeding further, let me share with you my personal perceptions about the general education, vocational education, and manpower communities.

1. Neither vocational education nor general education has done itself or its clients any good by a mutual disdain for the other.
2. Both general education and vocational education have failed to serve at all well the poor, the slow learners, the central city youth, and the isolated rural youth.
3. General education's failure to recognize the need for school-to-work and school-to-community transition and linkages borders on outright arrogance; at the least it is a remarkable display of loss of contact with reality.
4. Vocational education's continued slow response to adapting its programs to changing market needs can be explained in part by a lack of fiscal resources; it is mostly explained, however, by a mutually protective "good old boy" network that links land grant colleges and universities, old time labor, and old time agriculture to state and local vocational education

directors, advisory councils, and the American Vocational Association. (Let me hasten to add that in the last four years I have detected significant and spreading cracks in this long-time network.)

5. Virtually nonexistent at the high school level has been a cadre of trained vocational education counselors who understand the job market, who view job placement as a priority, and who routinely engage in placement follow-up studies. Also virtually nonexistent are general education administrators who have a respect for or admit to a need for vocational education programs for other than problem students and slow learners.

6. To introduce manpower personnel to vocational and general education personnel is to not only introduce strangers, it is also to introduce mutually suspicious and sometimes openly hostile strangers.

7. Many general educators believe that granting educational credit for out-of-school or on-the-job experience will lead to eroded standards and, potentially, to a further reduction in the teaching force.

8. The belief by some prime sponsors and by too many manpower personnel that all general education and vocational education programs are rigid and inflexible has seriously hampered dialogue and cooperation.

9. The practice of too many prime sponsors of ignoring existing and available secondary and postsecondary programs has led to costly program and facility duplication and an unneeded and unhealthy competition for the "cream of students" in the target population.

10. The lack of coordination between prime sponsors, vocational rehabilitation, and other publicly supported training programs has led to too many cases of students "program hopping" without any coherent or rational plan based upon the student's learning or training needs. (We must recognize, however, that part of the blame for this rests with congressional anti-comingling requirements.)

Before moving into a discussion of policy issues, let me make very clear to you that I do not believe that general and vocational education programs can or should serve all of the population targeted by CETA. But neither do I believe that the manpower community should be the sole service provider. We must cooperate; we must collaborate.

Policy Issue I

Getting Agreements to Collaborate

Back in the days when I served as a mediator to collective bargaining disputes, one of the more difficult tasks was getting the disputing factions back together again. Ultimately, however, their mutual recognition that one side controlled the needed skills for service delivery and the other side controlled the fiscal resources which paid those who provided the services created a sense of interdependence. One of the difficulties in developing collaboration between CETA and vocational education is that the basis for a mutually shared sense of interdependence is not easily fathomed. Not only that, but the two communities do not have either congruent or easily compatible fiscal or governance structures. The Congress has not mandated cooperation, and the traditional state educational governance authority can only use the jawbone power of the "bully boy pulpit," and then, often only with the cooperation of the governor.

But there are grounds for interdependence, and they spring in large part from a series of negative factors:

- The hard scrutiny of state and federal budget agencies regarding costly duplication and service overlapping in an era of tax and spending lids
- Congressional criticism of the vocational education community for failing to deliver and manage programs in a cost-effective way and of the CETA programs for waste, patronage, and outright fraud
- An unacceptably high rate of minority youth unemployment, and a student population which needs both education and training

There are also positive incentives:

- The fiscal resources of CETA and the in-place facilities and training know-how of vocational education
- The greatly heightened interest of governors and state level policy makers in collaboration
- The availability of incentive funds which, if wisely stewarded, can prove to be catalytic
- The change in CETA orientation from being concerned solely about job placement to meeting individuals' longer-term personal and occupational needs

Given a basis for collaboration, however, someone must play the role of facilitator/catalyst. Because the political contexts vary from state to state, the catalyst/facilitators must vary—governor, state board for elementary/secondary or vocational education, chief state school officer, state manpower director, a group of mayors, a group of business people, several legislators, a state vocational education director, and sometimes an outside force.

Policy Issue 2
Prime Sponsor and LEA Linkages

It is clear to us, as we have worked with state and local groups, that successful linkages occur when two or more individuals from each of the communities know and trust one another. When that trust is absent, how is it developed and who does it? This issue is closely linked to the issue of collaboration. From a policy standpoint, a governor or a state board can only encourage—they cannot mandate. They can develop state level facilitating teams; they can provide state fund incentives or add-ons for linkages. Of course, the federal government could also mandate local agreements of nonduplication between prime sponsors and agencies with in-place education and training programs.

What is needed, when preexisting trust between individuals from the two systems is absent, is dialogue, discussion, facilitated trust-building—the development of a sense of shared interdependence.

Policy Issue 3

Vocational Education Delivery System

Clearly here is an area where state boards can exercise considerable policy influence. When Congress enacted the youth initiative portions of CETA, it was their clear intent to—

1. focus on the disadvantaged, the handicapped, and women;
2. expose these populations of youth to the world of work;
3. encourage a far greater integration between the school site and the work site;
4. encourage potential school leavers to complete their schooling;
5. provide an alternative to in-school training programs; and,
6. aid the student in getting that first entry-level job.

CETA, then, is a targeted, work experience, and income maintenance program. It was created by Congress outside of the existing vocational education program and was designed specifically to respond to congressional priorities. The services are intended to be delivered at the grassroots level, ostensibly matching grassroots needs to future job market needs. CETA employs service delivery personnel who are predominately minority, young, and less credentialed than vocational education personnel.

I hope you have listened carefully to what I've said under this policy issue, because it clearly suggests some of the potential policy directions open to state boards. I do not believe that vocational education should rush to create cloned versions of the CETA delivery system. But, I most assuredly believe that policy makers must do the following:

1. Seriously (and ignoring the defensiveness of a large segment of vocational educators) examine and redefine the scope and responsibilities of vocational education, recognizing its interdependence with existing and future manpower needs.
2. Soberly and defensibly document the effectiveness and costs of current programs, discarding that which is no longer effective, relevant, or efficient.
3. Acknowledge the coming fundamental demographic shifts in our society and prepare vocational education to serve an adult and greying population who will seek skill retraining for a job change, skill updating, and outlets for the creative use of leisure time.

Let me be very clear here. There are many things that vocational education is doing well. We serve well the majority of the enrolled in-school population, although we clearly fail to adequately integrate general and vocational education. While we have begun to recognize the need to place some of our vocational training programs at the business and industrial site, we are still too captured by the belief that all programs should be school-based. We have not built a good data base, and perhaps that is our most urgent pressing need. Finally, let us be honest. We have not served either women, handicapped people, or urban minorities at all well. Either we start doing it and doing it almost overnight, or we deserve the criticisms and lawsuits those underserved clients are leveling.

Vocational education needs the CETA dollars in order to do better those things we choose to do. The educational system can be the major provider of CETA's educational component to the targeted population. CETA needs access to our facilities. But let's also recognize that CETA may be able to deal more effectively with out-of-school youth; in cooperation with general education, we can deal effectively with in-school youth. There are accommodations that can be made, and there are roles for both to play. But make no mistake—we have many changes to make, and they are not inconsequential.

Policy Issue 4
Education Credit

It is probably not surprising in an era of cries for a return to the basics and a demand for proof of competency before graduation that educators should be threatened by the notion of credit for out-of-school training. In my view, however, educators have elevated a non-issue to the level of a major tenet of faith and have surrounded it with the fervor of a righteously religious movement. We educators have so convinced ourselves that schooling and education are synonomous that we ignore reality. The reality is that by the time a student graduates he or she will have spent more time in front of a television set than in front of a teacher. The uncomfortable reality is that more of what we learn comes from outside the classroom than from inside. For educators to act as if it is not so is another grand demonstration of our loss of contact with reality.

The concept of providing academic credit for work experience is not new. School districts have been granting credit for distributive education, cooperative education, and experience-based career education for a long time. I suspect that the question is more one of who decides what will be credit-eligible. The initiative has come from the employment and training community, not education.

As a matter of policy, state and local boards have only one option—to grant credit for bona-fide and planned out-of-school training experience or work experience. As a matter of policy, however, there is another consideration: shouldn't in-school and out-of-school programs be based upon the individual skill and training needs of the student, and shouldn't they be goal and objective specific? I believe the answer is yes. Therefore I propose that every student in CETA/vocational programs have an IEP—individual educational program. (I happen to believe that all students should have an IEP. I see a great opportunity for vocational and CETA programs to become the pacesetters.) Thus, all learning and training programs students enroll in would be designed to reach specified outcomes; enrollment in or credit for programs other than that would not be allowed.

Policy Issue 5
Extended School Days, Facilities, and Teachers

There was a time, I think, when educators really believed that schools and school programs were designed to serve students. I can't pinpoint when that ceased to be the practice, but I think we have lost sight of that once-true belief. The thought of bringing street-wise teenagers back into traditional school programs is a bit difficult to comprehend. The kind of educational and training programs these people need, the kind of teaching skills needed, the location of these programs, and the time of the day and year they should be provided simply do not fit neatly into existing programs, existing teaching styles, existing school schedules, and existing school site locations.

As a matter of policy, then, the school day must be extended, and the long-cherished tradition of providing all school programs in a school facility discarded. Most importantly, any belief that the majority of the existing general education and vocational education teaching staff without inservice education have the skills, stamina, or understanding to teach this population of students is just plain false.

There are some things we can do well, and there are some things the employment and training community can do well. The areas of extended school days and year, facility sharing, transportation of students to outlying training sites, and teaching force exchanges are areas where we can effectively collaborate and cooperate.

In concluding my comments to you today, I want to share a general sense of uneasiness, a worry that in our rush to accommodate the pressures of the moment we will fail to institute systematic changes capable of accommodating a demographic time-bomb set to explode about 1995. Yes, we do today have an unacceptably large degree of minority youth unemployment. We also have at the present time an unacceptably large number of college graduates, and it appears that this trend will continue for at least the next ten years. These persons are taking lesser skilled jobs which creates a "bumping" effect. Should vocational education and CETA be preparing students for other than mere job entry positions and, if so, with what priority?

The Congress has enacted new retirement laws which guarantee longer years of employment to older workers. This may mean that more workers, frustrated by slow promotion, will seek job changes outside of their training/skill areas. What responsibility does vocational education have to provide that training, and with what priority?

Now I'd like to share with you some facts regarding the demographic time-bomb:

1. Enrollment in grades K-12 reached a peak of 51,309,000 in 1970 and by 1985 will decline to 44,500,000—a decline of 13 percent.
2. Secondary school enrollments peaked this year and through 1990 will decline by about 25 percent.
3. Yearly births have declined from 4.3 million in 1960 to 3.1 million in 1978, a decline of 28 percent.
4. The fertility rate has dropped from a figure of 3.8 per family unit in 1957 to 1.8 per family unit in 1976.
5. Life expectancy has risen from 47.3 years in 1900 to 73.1 years in 1976.
6. The growth of female-headed households with children has increased by over 250 percent since 1950.
7. Annual divorces as a percentage of annual marriages has increased from 25.8 percent in 1960 to 48.1 percent in 1976.
8. If present trends continue, 45 percent of the children born in 1976 will, at some time during their school years, live with only one parent.
9. The labor force now contains 13.6 million mothers with children under 18; 5.1 million of these mothers have children under the age of 6.
10. Of the current K-12 school population of approximately 48 million, 20.7 million have working mothers.
11. In the U.S. in 1800 the median age was 16; in 1981 it will be 30; in the year 2000 it will be 35.
12. By 1995, and for the first time in our history, the number of people age 55 and over will be larger than our school-age population.

To what extent do our current vocational education programs provide training suited to adults and women? To what extent do the current programs reflect the level of technology extant today in most businesses and industries? Can the vocational education community and the employment and training community really meet the training needs of a rapidly changing society without working together? What are the implications for all of education of these demographic facts? Are we, as education's leaders, thinking about the needed program changes?

My final worry has to do with our willingness and ability to meet the enormous challenges ahead—the very great need to cooperate with others, to modify our existing programs to serve better the unserved and the not-well-served, to phase out unneeded courses and to replace them with programs serving the occupational needs of a changing technology and an ever-changing agribusiness industry. To what extent are we training vocational educators to reflect those new realities? To what extent are we training vocational guidance staff who understand manpower needs and opportunities, who see value in vocational and technical training, who develop aggressive placement programs with strong follow-up study components?

Congress utilized CETA as the vehicle to reach a target population of students it believed general education and vocational education have not served well. Some have accused vocational education of being too rigid, too inflexible, and too in-grown. By and large, all of education has reacted defensively to the CETA initiatives; and for its part, the manpower community has too often viewed all general and vocational education programs as being bankrupt for the clients they serve.

As in the case of all overstatements, the truth is somewhere in between. It is clear to me, however, that there is more to be gained by cooperation and collaboration than by energy-draining bickering, blame-placing, competition for students, and unplanned program duplication.

Time is running out for the two communities to work together voluntarily. Congressional interest in collaboration is running high; and I understand that if we don't show evidence that we can develop meaningful collaborative efforts, we may be faced with mandated collaboration. It is imperative then that we identify those parts of the education and employment systems which do overlap in orientation, in programs, in services, and in population. Once identified, we must build upon the strengths of the two systems in responding to the educational and training needs of the students to be served.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question: Not only is the population diminishing, we are experiencing a sharp rise in the number of children born into disadvantaged families. In addition, the largest number of unwed mothers last year were ten to fourteen years old. What implications do these statistics have for the future of American education?

We happen to have a three-year project dealing with unwed mothers and parenting. The actual statistic is that 34 percent of the women in this country under nineteen will become pregnant. Not all of these pregnancies will occur outside of marriage, and not all of those who become pregnant will carry the child to term. In Washington, D.C. last year, and for the first time in history for that city, 52 percent of all the live births were to unwed girls under the age of nineteen. I don't know the rest of the statistics. I suspect that if you go into this country's major urban centers, the Washington statistic can be repeated.

I guess the one thing that ought to be clear to all of us is that the traditional notion of the family being headed by a mother and a father with two little children and a puppy dog in front of a fireplace exists only in our minds. The reality is that very close to half of the families of America are single-parent families, most often headed by a mother. From my perspective I think the implications have a great deal to say about child care centers, about the kinds of social services that will have to be provided (not necessarily by the school but certainly in cooperation with the school, given the fact of working mothers). I suspect that these implications also have a great deal to say about when adult educational experiences should be provided, since all mothers don't work 8:00 to 4:00 or swing shifts, so we're going to have to be flexible.

I think the other implication is the kind of focus we as a society should be placing on parenting. I don't think that divorced mothers and fathers love their children less. I think that they're just as concerned about the welfare of their children. But because they also have to work they are especially concerned about the quality of time spent with their children. I think the schools have a role to play in helping parents to understand how they can improve the quality of time they spend with their children. Mothers and fathers still continue to be concerned about the educational process of their children. I think the schools are going to have to pay a lot more attention to how we involve parents in the learning process, especially the learning process of children in the primary grades.

It is a statistical fact that the numbers of children being born into what one would call a disadvantaged environment is on the rise. As one plays that out, and as one plays out the number of single families and the increase in the "graying" population, all these factors have enormous implications for how the social services of our society will have to be reordered. And these factors will certainly have an effect on the priority that will be assigned to education. I think one of the realities we as educators have to confront is that by 1995 over half of the population will be 55 and above. This population will be larger than the in-school population. This older population will, in all probability, place a much lower priority on education, but not because of lack of interest. It's just that when people live on fixed incomes, they become increasingly concerned about security, where the food is coming from, police protection, fire protection, and all the other practical aspects of life. Concern for education has to come after these concerns. That's a reality. I think those are the kinds of things that we as educators have to think about. I don't know what that means for vocational education, but it has a lot of implications for education in general.

Question: What is the impact of the heavy emphasis upon licensing and credentialing upon the way educational credit is awarded? I'm thinking not just in terms of teachers and "professionals," but in terms of credentialing for carpenters, plumbers, skilled tradespeople, etc.

We have created a system of credentialing in the United States that was essentially designed to guarantee a level of quality to students. That probably made sense in the 1800s and the early 1900s, and I think it will continue to make some sense in the future. But I'm not certain that it makes a great deal of sense when we start talking about occupational and skill training. It seems to me that instructors who provide skill and occupational training may or may not have to be certified to teach, but I think they have to be certified as being talented tradespeople. I'm not certain that it is necessary or even wise that those people have a teaching certificate. I think what is important is that they have a sense of how to work with young people or adults, and those two are not necessarily the same. I think there will always be a need for vocational educators to be certified. I'd make a distinction between *skill training* and *vocational education,* and I've tried to make that distinction in my comments today.

Question: What about establishing some sort of credential for the graduates of programs in the skilled trades area?

Some of the teacher education associations are attempting to do this through professional practice commissions. I suspect that this may be one means of accomplishing that goal. However, my own personal view is that we ought to move forward rapidly to create regional centers within states to monitor individual educational programs. These regional centers would be responsible for evaluating the effectiveness of programs. They would also have the responsibility for establishing some way of certifying the degree of success students achieved in reaching the goals of their programs. They would be ultimately responsible for saying, "Yes, this person has all the skills and competencies necessary to enter the profession," or "No, this student lacks sufficient skill and expertise."

Question: What do you see as the role of the federal government in the policy issues we've talked about? Do you see the federal government exercising more control or less control in the future?

It probably won't surprise you that, given my position as executive director of the National Association of State Boards of Education, I am not an advocate of more federal control. I think it's legitimate that the federal government should continue to identify those areas of social need that must be addressed by the states and localities. What I think is *inappropriate* is for the federal government to tell the states and localities how those local needs must be met. I feel it is entirely appropriate for the federal government to say, "These are social needs of our society, and these are the minimum standards that must be achieved, but we will leave to the states and the localities to play out for themselves how they will design programs to meet the needs of their communities and their states." My support for the Department of Education not withstanding, I personally believe that we have seen the zenith of federal regulation specificity in Public Law 94-142, the law that deals with the handicapped and the education of handicapped children. I do not believe that we will see again soon that kind of highly prescriptive legislation.

I also take the view that there are at present simply far too many (70 to 120) categorical programs at the federal level. If our society continues to be confronted with fiscal constraints, if the societal needs in America continue their rapid rate of change, I do not believe that we are going to see all of these categorical programs continued. I think there's going to be a collapse of these categorical programs, and I think it will take place around programs for vocational and occupational preparation and for the handicapped, the bilingual, and the disadvantaged. I think there is going to be a great deal of pushing and tugging at the federal level among the various lobbying groups that represent the various categorical programs. I think there is an increasing recognition at the federal level that there isn't a great deal of payoff for the federal government in terms of effectiveness and efficiency in the small category programs—those that range in size from 3 million on up to 15 or 16 million. That's where I feel the vast majority of the categoricals fall down. Programs in vocational education, programs for the handicapped and bilingual, Title I and ESEA account for about 85 percent of the federal funds. My own personal view is that we are going to see *less,* not *more,* federal involvement in the future.

Question: What is the relationship in the public schools of competency-based, criterion-referenced testing and individual education programs?

Probably no movement in education has so captured the imagination of legislators and state boards in a five-year period as competency-based education. We have just distributed to all state boards in the United States our new publication called *Minimum Competency Education: The State of the Art.* In the introduction, I state my personal view that never have policy makers less understood the implications of their policy decision than when they decided to promote competency-based programs. I think it's possible to establish competencies, particularly if you are thinking in terms of remediation. I think it's possible to say that before students move on to another unit of instruction, they ought to achieve a certain level of competency. But then those youngsters should have available to them the kind of remediation programs that will give them the fullest opportunity to move ahead. We can't put students on a slag heap just because they failed to demonstrate minimum competencies in a given area.

I do not think it necessarily incompatible that IEPs and minimum standards co-exist. I think an individual educational program could be identified for a certain student, and at the same time it should be recognized that at some point there will be a check for certain minimum standards that the student will have to achieve. The kind of remediation the student may need should be in place, ready to be utilized if the student fails to demonstrate minimum competencies. We can hope that, given that kind of educational system, the vast majority of youngsters would succeed.

Recently Dave Berliner completed some amazing research in Arizona. Berliner and his colleagues spent time in over 2500 classrooms and discovered that those teachers whose youngsters had statistically significant achievement in terms of being variant from the majority did a number of things differently from the rest of the teachers. First of all, they spent time on learning tasks. The time they spent on the instructional learning task went to reading, writing, and arithmetic; and I don't mean to use this as an argument for those kinds of basics, but those teachers made a difference. These same teachers seemed to minimize the amount of transition time—the amount of time spent on getting ready to go to lunch or recess, on getting ready to go to the next instructional task, etc. All this had a great impact. The research team found that there was tremendous variance from teacher to teacher on the amount of time spent in transition. They also found that teachers who designed tests that were highly congruent with the material taught had a significant impact. Teachers who took the attitude that youngsters need to have a high degree of front-end success as opposed to failure on learning tasks had a significant impact. And finally, these teachers also saw their responsi-

bility as designing instructional units to fit the child, designing remediation units to help those kids who didn't do well the first time, and providing their youngsters with consistent feedback. The teachers who did all of those things, time after time, regardless of the cultural setting, regardless of whether or not the students in the class were "disadvantaged"—those teachers made a difference.

The thing that's interesting about this study is that the successful teachers were using fairly straightforward common sense methods. Yet the research team found that this is not the norm. Well, if you identify competencies and you put an IEP together with that kind of teaching strategy, I think it makes sense. But simply to impose a competency test at grade twelve without any remediation—a test that means students at grade twelve who don't pass will simply not be allowed to graduate—that's a situation I have a lot of difficulty with.

Question: How would you characterize the CETA program? Is it really a work experience and income maintenance program?

My remarks on CETA were framed, I think, in the context of what the law was intended to do. In formulating my comments I drew from the beliefs of the congressional staffers that I have talked to and also from Bob Taggart and some other people in CETA. I think it's their general belief that CETA truly is a targeted, work experience, and income maintenance program. That is their belief and that, right now, is the belief of Congress. Whether or not that is in fact true is subject to debate.

I recognize that there is some conflicting evidence. There are differences of opinion on the degree to which it is a work experience program, but the program at least puts in place mechanisms that can be used for work experience. I think it is an income maintenance program, at least for the period of time that one can stay on the roll. I also recognize the degree to which mayors and county commissioners use it as a vehicle for countering cyclical employment. But as I said before, most congressional staffers I've talked to see CETA as a work experience and income maintenance program, and that is how Bob Taggert defines and explains the CETA program.

Question: We are currently seeing a trend where people are dropping out of school at an early age and then reentering as adults for retraining. In view of this trend, wouldn't the program you propose be much easier to implement if we could get our educational system to think in terms of life-long learning rather than responsibility for learning only in terms of the traditional K-12 structure?

I don't disagree with that, but I think we've got a couple of small things that will get in the way of that happening. I say this in seriousness. The things that get in the way are called constituency groups. American education today is controlled by a group of associations which includes, among others, the textbook companies and the certification credentialing bodies. Each of these groups ostensibly has the best interests of children in mind, but when you get down to the bottom line (my bottom line), what I'm paid for as executive director is to protect the interests of state board members. The responsibility of Terry Herndon and John Ryor at the NEA is to protect the interests of the teacher. The responsibility of the director of the community college system is to protect the interests of the community colleges.

Any solution that requires cutting across current government responsibilities and authority, any solution that requires the redistribution of power, is going to be very difficult to bring about. I don't care how good the proposed system is, it's going to be tough to bring about. I happen to agree with you. I think that if we would view education as truly life-long, if we would view education

as not a thing that goes sequentially but in units that people could take at convenient stages of their lives, moving out and back in over long periods of time, then that makes a lot of sense. But that's not the way the funding structures are put together, and that certainly isn't the way the turf is laid out. I think it would be enormously difficult to do what you propose. Now, I'm equally pessimistic about what happens if we don't have those kinds of systemic solutions. The alternate solutions are called vouchers, they're called tuition tax credits, and they're called private schools.

American education is under serious attack. And it's under attack because, in many ways, we have a system today that was built and based on the agrarian family-centered units of the early 1800s. None of that exists anymore. We are a different kind of society today. Our system was designed to teach essentially white, middle-class Americans some basic moral values, how to carry on family traditions, and how to get ahead. It was not necessarily designed to deal with a multicultural society that has fundamental conflicts among its diverse elements. I don't have an answer to your question, but I have some real fears about what's going to happen to the public school systems of America unless we're able to move toward the kind of system you're proposing—a system where kids can move in and move out, come back in and go out, without paying attention to "turf." But such a radical restructure of our educational system is difficult to bring about.

Question: You mentioned the need for vocational education to redefine its scope and mission. Are you recommending a division of labor between vocational education and CETA along in-school lines for vocational education and out-of-school lines for CETA? Doesn't this imply a reduced role for vocational education and adult programs?

Let me be clear about what I said. I talked about in-school youth and out-of-school youth, and when I talked about out-of-school youth I was essentially talking about dropouts. I wasn't necessarily talking about adult learners. I happen to believe that there is a role for vocational education to play in adult education. I think there is a very large role, and I think that is the future role. I think vocational education must look increasingly at adult education. I think your competition is called the community college system, and I think we will have some very interesting power struggles in the future about who will in fact serve the adult population. I also think that we have some very practical fiscal problems. In particular, I don't see the states as able to continue to support the kinds of competing jurisdictions that we currently have.

I do not recommend a division of labor between CETA and vocational education along the lines of adults, but I think CETA in many ways is much better designed to deal with those youngsters the general school program has failed. That's why I said that it doesn't make a lot of sense to me to bring youngsters who failed or dropped out of the traditional general education program back into that school environment when we didn't have programs for them before. I think those are the kinds of youngsters that CETA can work with. I think we also have to do something about our in-school programs to reduce the number of youngsters who move out because we either don't have programs designed for them or the programs we have don't meet their needs. But in the short term, I think CETA is better designed to deal with out-of-school youth.

Question: According to the demographic trends you outlined, I see a greater need for training for entry-level workers rather than for adult education in general. Would you please comment on the role of the schools in entry-level job training?

Good question. I think there are some very practical limits on the degree to which, in the K-12 structure, we can train the kind of skilled workers that our highly technological society will need. I

think that there are certain cluster skills that we can teach in the K-12 structure, but I think that the community college system, vocational/technical centers, and area vocational schools will be the ones that will fine-tune the kind of highly specified skills that certain of the job markets will be needing. I also happen to think that the corporations and businesses are going to take over an increasing role in this area. Last year business and industry spent approximately $45 billion on training. So, as I look at the high level of skills needed by many of our workers today, I have some questions about the degree to which the K-12 unit can provide those skills. What I do see the K-12 structure being able to provide are some entry-level skills, particularly for job clusters. Training for the more technological skills will increasingly be taken over by community colleges, vocational tech centers, area vocational schools, and business and industry. I don't think that we should stop giving skill training altogether; I just think that there are some very practical limits on what we can do.

LEADERSHIP SERIES
IN VOCATIONAL AND CAREER EDUCATION

Baker, Eva L. ***New Directions in Evaluation Research: Implications for Vocational Education***, 1979 (OC 55—$1.90).

Barlow, Melvin. ***Implications from the History of Vocational Education***, 1976 (OC 15—$1.00).

Bell, Terrel H. ***The Place of Vocational Education in Higher Education: Implications for Education R&D***, 1976 (DL 4—$1.50).

Bell, Terrel H. and Hoyt, Kenneth B. ***Career Education: The U.S.O.E. Perspective***, 1974 (OC 4—$1.50).

Bottoms, James E. ***Implications of the New Vocational Education Legislation for Program Research and Development***, 1976 (OC 23—$1.75).

Buzzell, Charles H. ***Productivity: Implications for Vocational Education***, 1976 (OC 19—$1.00).

Clark, David L. ***Federal Policy in Educational Research and Development***, 1974 (OC 5—$1.50).

Clark, David L. ***Research and Development Productivity in Educational Organizations***, 1978 (OC 41—$2.20).

Cohen, Wilbur J. ***Needed Federal Policy in Education for Century III***, 1977 (OC 24—$1.90).

Cyphert, Frederick. ***Forces Affecting Program Development in Higher Education: Is Anyone Driving?*** 1975 (OC 11—$1.00).

Day, Sherman. ***Education and Training in the Criminal Justice System: Implications for Vocational Education Research and Development***, 1979 (OC 52—$1.90).

Delacruz, Joseph B. ***Educational Programs for Native Americans: Implications for Vocational Education Research and Development***, 1978 (OC 40—$1.90).

Ellis, John. ***Vocational Education and Federal Priorities***, 1978 (OC 47—$1.90).

Ellis, Mary L. ***Vocational Education: The Future is Now***, 1978 (OC 37—$1.90).

Evans, Rupert. ***Vocational Education R and D in the Past Decade: Implications for the Future***, 1976 (OC 18—$1.00).

Fallstrom, Charles M. ***The Changing Secondary Education Scene: Implications for Vocational Education Research and Development***, 1976 (OC 22—$1.75).

Gideonse, Hendrik. ***A Model for Educational Research and Development: 1985***, 1978 (OC 44—$2.20).

Ginzberg, Eli. ***Strategies for Education Reform***, 1972-73 (DL 1—$1.00).

Gleazer, Edmund J. ***View on Community and Junior College Education***, 1975 (OC 9—$1.00).

Goldhammer, Keith. ***Extending Career Education Beyond the Schoolhouse Walls***, 1974 (OC 3—$2.00).

Halperin, Samuel. ***Emerging Educational Policy Issues in the Federal City: A Report from Washington***, 1978 (OC 42—$2.20).

Herr, Edwin L. ***Work Focused Guidance for Youth in Transition: Some Implications for Vocational Education Research and Development***, 1978 (OC 43—$2.20).

Hicks, Laurabeth L. ***Programs of Guidance and Counseling Becoming of Age: Implications for Vocational Education R&D***, 1977 (OC 25—$1.75).

Hoyt, Kenneth B. ***Career Education, Vocational Education, and Occupational Education: An Approach to Defining Differences***, 1973-74 (DL 2—$1.25).

Jennings, John F. and Radcliffe, Charles W. ***Commentary on Legislation Affecting Vocational Education Research and Development***, 1977 (OC 27—$1.90).

Kolstoe, Oliver P. ***Implications of Research Findings on Vocational and Career Education for the Mentally Handicapped***, 1977 (OC 33—$1.90).

Kottman, Roy M. ***Building a Constituency for Research and Development***, 1975 (OC 10—$1.00).

Krathwohl, David. ***Improving Educational Research and Development***, 1976 (OC 21—$2.20).

Kreitlow, Burton W. ***Trends in Adult Education with Implications for Vocational Education***, 1976 (OC 13—$1.25).

Kruger, Daniel H. ***Occupational Preparation Programs: Implications for Vocational Education***, 1977 (OC 31—$1.90).

Levitan, Sar A. ***The Unemployment Numbers Is the Message***, 1977 (OC 38—$1.90).

McCage, Ronald D. ***The Development of a Comprehensive State Capacity for Program Improvement***, 1978 (OC 34—$1.75).

McCune, Shirley D. ***The Organized Teaching Profession and R&D***, 1977 (OC 29—$1.90).

Marland, Sidney P. ***Career Education: Retrospect and Prospect***, 1974-75 (DL 3—$2.00).

Martin, Edwin. ***New Directions in Vocational Education for the Handicapped: Implications for Research and Devleopment***, 1978 (OC 35—$1.75).

Moody, Tom. ***Vocational Education, CETA, and Youth Unemployment: Meeting the Needs of Inner City Youth,*** 1979 (OC 50—$1.75).

Parnes, Herbert S. ***A Conceptual Framework for Human Resource Policy: Implications for Vocational Education Research and Development***, 1976 (OC 14—$1.00).

Petty, Reginald. ***Trends and Issues in Vocational Education: Implications for Vocational Education Research and Development***, 1978 (OC 46—$1.90).

Pucinski, Roman. ***The Role of State and Local Advisory Councils in Vocational Education***, 1978 (OC 36—$1.90).

Reider, Corinne H. ***Women, Work and Vocational Education***, 1977 (OC 26—$1.90).

Rosen, Howard. ***Recent Manpower Legislation and Programs: Implications for Research and Development***, 1975 (OC 7—$1.00).

Scanlon, Robert C. ***Public Schools for the 80's: Implications for Vocational and Career Education R&D***, 1976 (OC 20—$1.50).

Schmidt, Hermann. ***Current Problems of Vocational Education in the Federal Republic of Germany***, 1979 (OC 54—$1.90).

Siffin, William. ***Institutional Building in Technical Assistance: The Design Perspective and Some Implications for Research and Development in Vocational Education***, 1975 (OC 8—$1.00).

Simpson, Elizabeth J. ***The Home as a Learning Center for Vocational Development***, 1976 (OC 16—$1.00).

Sticht, Thomas G. ***Literacy and Vocational Competence***, 1978 (OC 39—$2.80).

Tolbert, Jack F. ***The Role of Private Trade and Technical Schools in a Comprehensive Human Development System: Implications for Research and Development***, 1979 (OC 55—$1.90).

Wallace, Bertran F. ***Desegregation and Its Implications for Vocational and Career Education***, 1977 (OC 30—$1.75).

Wills, Joan. ***Youth Unemployment: Implications for Vocational Education R&D***, 1977 (OC 32—$1.75).

Wirtz, Willard R. and Ford, Gerald R. ***Bringing the World of Work and the Institutions of Education Closer Together***, 1977 (OC 28—$1.75).

Wirtz, Willard R. ***Community Education Work Councils***, 1976 (OC 17—$1.00).

ORDERING INFORMATION

All prices include postage and handling. When ordering use series numbers and titles. Orders of $10.00 or less will be accepted on a cash, check, or money order basis only. Purchase orders will be accepted for orders in excess of $10.00. Please make check or money order payable to: **The National Center for Research in Vocational Education**. Mail remittance and/or purchase order to: National Center Publications, The Ohio State University, 1960 Kenny Road, Columbus, OH 43210. (Prices subject to change.)

The Lecture Series at the National Center for Research in Vocational Education was established to provide a forum for discussing current issues confronting educational research and development among distinguished professionals and National Center and Ohio State University staff. Points of view or opinions do not necessarily represent official National Center or Ohio State University position or policy.